


Furthermore, the examiner has failed to clearly articulate a reason why the combination of the references is obvious, as required by MPEP 2143 that states: "The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit."

Also, regarding dependent claims 43,44,46-49, and 54-56, please reconsider: the use of an old discarded lens is a new and unobvious use of an old lens that would otherwise be thrown away. Who would think of using an old discarded lens in this highly unusual manner. The user of applicant's novelty eye patch is not a manufacturer saving manufacturing costs. The user has already paid for her new up to date corrective lenses.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Nathans

Registration # 19,558.

978-667-3060; robnathans@aol.com